

THE REBEL

Vol. 1. No. 7.

CALGARY, ALBERTA, AUGUST 27, 1937.

10 Cents.

Why Communists Support Aberhart

Comparison of Social Credit and Communist Doctrines Reveals Unity of Principles

Even during the election campaign which swept the Aberhart party into power it was no secret that the Communist party of the province was deeply sympathetic toward the methods and aims of the so-called Social Credit party. Leading Communists let it be publicly known on various occasions that the Social Credit program fitted admirably with the doctrines of Communism, and members of this anti-British cult were widely encouraged by their own leaders to support the Aberhart party.

Apparently nothing has transpired since the Social Credit party went into power to make it any less acceptable to the Communists. In fact, developments during this time indicate that the Social Credit and Communist parties have been drawn even more closely together, a fact which can have no other explanation than commonness of aims and ideals. Communists have declared their satisfaction with the type of legislation enacted by the Aberhart government by admitting that under the circumstances they could not have done better themselves.

But of particular interest is the secret conference held in the legislative buildings a few weeks ago between the chairman of the Social Credit board, the two experts, Powell and Byrne, and the heads of the Communist party of Alberta. It may or may not be significant that in his letter of invitation to the Communists chairman MacLachlan referred to the latter's party as a "democratic" organization. The full details of what transpired at this conference are not known, and the press took only the scantiest notice of the meeting. However, it is strikingly significant that since the conference was held Communist sympathy for the Social Credit party has become even more manifest. Communists are supporting the Social Credit "true blue" pledge scheme and are even speaking from Social Credit platforms. At a recent Social Credit meeting in Drumheller, the spirit of unity between the two parties was realistically demonstrated when the Communist guest speaker was introduced to the gathering as "Comrade."

Can the people of Alberta afford to be indifferent to this development in our political tangle? Or would it be well to probe into the matter with the view to discovering the reasons for this apparent

(Continued on Page Two)

Government's Rabble-Rousing Tactics Contain Seeds of Open Insurrection

For perhaps the first time in history a supposedly democratic government is deliberately inciting its political followers to active and open rebellion against the very institutions of law and order which it is under solemn obligation to uphold and defend. Forced into an untenable position by the introduction of palpably illegal legislation as an ill-advised pretense at fulfilment, of a promise it has discovered to be

outside of its power to carry into effect, the Alberta government now seeks to shift its responsibility back to the people who elected it. But in order to cover the deception, its followers are to be fooled into the belief that demonstrations and indignation meetings against the dissenting citizens of the land will accomplish the miracle which the government has not the magical power to perform.

We may be all wrong. But whether the purpose of the government is merely one of building up sentiment for an election, attempting to provide an alibi for failure, or of seriously challenging the federal Bank Act, is of no great moment in itself. What is of extremely serious importance is the fact of the government's incitation to what is in effect defiance of authority superior to its own. Therefore, whatever the purpose or intent of the government, it is certainly playing with dynamite when it deliberately sets out to incite the people to a course of action possessing all the inherent elements

THE "TOUGH GUY"



DRAWN BY WILLIAM ZELINSKY, CALGARY

of violent revolution

When Gerry McGeer sowed the wind by his declaration that he would help to throw the bondholders into the bay at Vancouver, he reaped the whirlwind of violence and bloodshed by those who regarded his foolish utterance as an invitation to open insurrection. And no amount of protestation of pious intentions by the Alberta government can alter the fact that its call to one element of the populace to make "visible and audible" demonstrations against those who reject the Social Credit theory, constitutes by its very nature an open invitation to dissenters to express themselves no less vigorously in opposition. In fact, those opposed to the government's political theories have no alternative but to regard its actions as a direct threat to their rights as citizens and as a challenge to counter every move by the government with methods

(Continued on Page Four)

WHY COMMUNISTS SUPPORT ABERHART—

(Continued from Page One)

unanimity of principles and ideals of the Social Credit and Communist parties? Perhaps a comparison of the Social Credit philosophy as revealed in the utterances and conduct of its chief proponents with the doctrines of Communism would be enlightening. Such a study may offer a logical explanation as to why an alliance between Social Credit and Communism is the most natural development to be expected.

The Rebel can render no greater service to the people of Alberta at this time than to aid them in arriving at a proper evaluation of this development. To this end, it is essential to have an accurate and absolutely reliable view of Communist doctrines, aims, objects and methods for comparison with those of Social Credit. To provide this view and comparison, we quote here pertinent extracts from the Judgment of the Ontario Court of Appeal delivered on February 19, 1932, by the then Chief Justice Mulock in the case of Rex versus Tim Buck, prominent Communist leader. It is to be noted that this judgment is supported largely on the sworn testimony of Tim Buck himself. The official report can be found in volume 57, Canadian Criminal Cases, commencing at page 290. On page 294 the Chief Justice in his summary of the evidence says:

"The jury having found the accused guilty of being members of an unlawful association, it becomes necessary to study the evidence carefully in order to ascertain whether any of the purposes and teachings of the Communist Party of Canada furnished reasonable evidence in support of the jury's findings. If they do, this Court has no right to disturb them.

"The evidence proves that the Communist Party of Canada is a member of the Communist International of Russia and that instead of determining its own policies, purposes, teachings and aims, it adopted and adopts those of the Communist International, and therefore, whatever are the policies, purposes, teachings and aims of the Communist International are also automatically those of the Communist Party of Canada.

"The Communist International has by its Theses and Statutes declared what are its policies, purposes, teachings and aims, and, therefore, an examination of these Theses and Statutes will enable us to determine also those of the Communist Party of Canada.

"According to the evidence of the accused Timothy Buck, large numbers of Communists in Canada, in the fall of 1920, secured copies of these Theses and Statutes and in 1921 several groups of Communists held a conference in Canada and formed an association called the Communist Party of Canada. Buck testified that the Communist Party of Canada was a section of the Communist International, and that from the year 1924 onward the above-named Theses and Statutes became binding upon the Communist Party of Canada."

The Chief Justice then quoted from the theses and statutes of the Communist International from official exhibits at the trial, and from these we submit extracts, together with quotations from Social Crediters and our own comment:

"...The Communist International considers the dictatorship of the proletariat as the only means for the liberation of humanity from the horrors of capitalism."—Messrs. Powell and Byrne, Mr. Aberhart himself, and other S.C. leaders have repeatedly declared that Social Credit is "dictatorship by the people."

"Only a violent defeat of the bourgeoisie, the confiscation of its property, the annihilation of the entire bourgeois governmental apparatus, parliamentary, judicial, military, bureaucratic, administrative, municipal, etc., even the individual exile of the most stubborn, and dangerous exploiters, the establishment of a strict control over them for the repression of all inevitable attempts at resistance and restoration of capitalistic slavery, only such measures will be able to guarantee the complete submission of the whole class of exploiters."—Compare this with the confiscatory legislation of the Aberhart government in regard to interest and debts, the legislation to interfere with the courts of justice, the laws to deprive citizens of their civil rights, the boycott of opposition newspapers and desire to license them, the hand-picking of members of the legislature, the strict control exercised over party members, etc. Only the other day Aberhart declared that those who refused to co-operate will be told to "get out of the way." N. B. James, M.L.A.: "We will make these people co-operate or force them out of the province." Hon. W. A. Fallow: "They are giving us a rough ride now, but that is nothing to what we will do to them before we get through with them." R. E.

Ansley, M.L.A.: "Legislation must be drastic and knock our enemies off their pedestals." Walter Kuhl, Social Credit M.P.: "If laws clash they should be brushed aside.... The people of Alberta demanded action, and they should be given action NO MATTER HOW MANY LAWS ARE BROKEN.... We won't stop at anything." J. M. Popyl, M.L.A.: "Some of our opponents are going to get plenty yet. They will not have to wait long." And from Major Douglas himself: "The general population should be mobilised to demand absolute priority for these results HOWEVER OBTAINED." It will be readily appreciated that all of these acts and utterances are in the most perfect harmony with Communist doctrine. We continue:

"A theoretical difference of opinion on the question of 'democracy' becomes inevitable on the morrow of the victory, a question which can only be decided by force of arms."—This difference of opinion has been much accentuated of late in the peculiar definitions of democracy by Social Crediters as being the "will of the people" exclusively as represented by the clamorous voice of its party following, without regard to the rights and privileges of others. Whether "force of arms" is to decide the question remains to be seen; but as indicated by foregoing quotations from leading Social Crediters, it is clear that heads of the party would not be averse to the use of force as a means of settling the question.

"The experience of the Russian Communist party in its successful leadership of the civil war of the working classes during three years has proved that the victory of the workers is impossible without a severe discipline and a perfected centralization and the fullest confidence of all organizations of the party in the leading organ of the party."—Discipline and centralization have reached a high state of perfection in the Alberta S.C. movement. Fortunately for Alberta, the "official organ" of the party, due to its actual operation by a non-Social Creditor, has not inspired the "fullest confidence" of the organization; but this is accorded blindly to the party chieftan, Aberhart.

MASS DEMONSTRATIONS

"The elementary means of the struggle of the proletariat against the rule of the bourgeoisie is first of all the method of mass demonstrations. Such mass demonstrations are prepared and carried out by the organized masses of the proletariat under the direction of the united, disciplined, centralized Communist party. Civil war is war. In this war the proletariat must have its efficient political officers, its good political General Staff, to conduct operations during all the stages of that fight. Mass struggle means a whole system of developing demonstrations growing ever more acute in form and logically leading to an uprising against the capitalistic order of government. In this warfare of the masses developing into civil war, the guiding party of the proletariat must as a general rule secure every and all lawful positions, making them its auxiliaries in the revolutionary work and subordinating such positions to the plans of the general campaign, that of the mass struggle."—How perfectly this describes what is going on in Alberta today. Mass demonstrations are being conducted in all sections of the province upon the specific orders of the "General Staff" in Edmonton. Rabble-rousing is the order of the day. From his Edmonton and Calgary pulpits the premier is exhorting his followers to militant action, and on the public platform he and other cabinet ministers as well as a host of lesser lights are working overtime to incite the populace to feverish, emotional "visible and audible" demonstrations of indignation against the opposition to their party ambitions. Official positions are made "auxiliaries in the revolutionary work" and subordinated to the "plans of the general campaign" issued by a pair of imported "experts." Hon. W. A. Fallow: "You (the people) are the army; we are the officers." Fred Anderson, M.L.A.: "This is a real war we're going into, and some are bound to get hurt." Which is the more likely source of inspiration of Social Credit, the Almighty, as Aberhart claims, or Moscow, as the foregoing would indicate?

If the Communists have a majority in the local government institutions, they must carry on a wholesale opposition against the bourgeois central authority.... Attempt to establish an armed working militia.... Boycotting the elections or the parliament or leaving the parliament is permissible chiefly when there is a possibility of an immediate transition to an armed fight for power."—The carrying on of wholesale opposition against the central or federal government is without doubt one of the principal activities of the Social Credit government, both in and out of the legislature. Practically all of its major legislation has been in

open defiance of the senior government and its general propaganda is openly designed to defy and harass federal authorities. And read this extract from a letter written by Major Douglas to Aberhart: "I suggest that in the present circumstances every effort be made . . . that administratively everything be done to transfer control over its police force and public services to the province and to **WITHDRAW** from the use of Federally controlled institutions of this character." The obvious purpose of this is to provide the province with an armed force under its sole control. In this connection bear in mind, too, the recent agitation of Social Crediters for the establishment of a provincial police force.

ANSWERABLE TO PARTY ONLY

The same paragraph of the thesis continues:

"The Communist members shall make all their parliamentary work dependent on the work of the party outside of parliaments . . . The Communist member is answerable, not to the wide mass of his constituents, but to his own Communist party, whether lawful or unlawful . . ." Substitute "Social Credit" for "Communist" in the foregoing, and it fits the Alberta situation in the respect under review with perfect accuracy. Every activity of the Social Credit member, provincial or federal, is made strictly subservient to the scheming and plotting of the party independent of parliament; and Premier Aberhart as well as others of his party have made it unmistakably clear time and again that they regard themselves as answerable only to their party. Perhaps the classical example of this is Mr. Aberhart's reply to a question by the Calgary Herald as to the probable time of the payment of the dividend. It is worth quoting here again to emphasize his obviously Communist conception of responsibility to the people. He said: "I have been thinking since what **RIGHT** the Herald has, or had, to ask such a question. Has the editor of the Herald signed up under the Social Credit registration, or had he not? The Herald might just as well ask any company in town regarding the declaration of its dividends. They are entirely outside of this whole business. There is a question the Herald should have asked, and that is: 'When do you expect to pass the order-in-council licensing the press?'"

Referring to England and other countries having colonial possessions, the thesis says:

"The revolution in the colonies is not going to be a Communist revolution in its first stages. But if from the outset the leadership is in the hands of a Communist vanguard, the revolutionary masses will not be led astray, but may go ahead through the successive periods of development of revolutionary experience . . . In its first stages the revolution must be carried on with a program which will include many petty bourgeois reform clauses such as division of land, etc."—Is it any wonder that Communists are pleased with the tactics employed by the Alberta government? It is apparent that they regard the present procedure as a satisfactory Communist vanguard action playing directly into their hands, and they can therefore ignore the "petty bourgeois reform clauses" adhering to some of the Social Credit legislation as inconsequential in themselves and possibly even as useful camouflage for hiding the real issues. So much is certain, that the condition in Alberta today has all the marks of a revolution in the "first stages" as held desirable by the Communist International.

Farmers would do well to ponder over this extract:

"The landed peasants or farmers are capitalists in agriculture, usually managing their lands with several hired laborers. . . . This is the most numerous element of the bourgeois class and a decided enemy of the revolutionary proletariat. After the victory of the proletariat in the towns this class will inevitably oppose it by all means from sabotage to open armed counter-revolutionary resistance. The revolutionary proletariat must therefore immediately begin to prepare the necessary force for the disarmament of every single man of this class, and, together with the overthrow of the capitalists in industry, the proletariat must deal a relentless, crashing blow to this class."

Another most enlightening declaration of the thesis says:

"The class struggle in almost every country of Europe and America is entering the phase of civil war. Under such conditions the Communists can have no confidence in bourgeois laws. They should create everywhere a parallel illegal apparatus which at the decisive moment should be of assistance to the party to do its duty toward the revolution. In every country where, in consequence of martial law or of other exceptional laws, the Communists are unable to carry on their work legally, a combination of legal and illegal work is absolutely necessary."—Mrs. Edith Gostick, M.L.A.: "You must rebel . . . against the system."

Clearly, this Social Crediter regards the present state as one of revolution or "civil war," at least as incipiently so. Disrespect and contempt for the higher laws of the land are openly advocated and in the legislature they are made manifest by the government's illegal legislation. There are even threats of secession from the Dominion. One such is contained in the telegram sent to Premier King by the Ponoka Social Credit group. It said in part: "Interference from the federal authorities shielding the banks most dangerous to Confederation, considering the high tension here." And Major Douglas on page 94 of his "The Alberta Experiment," writes: ". . . In particular, Ministers should refuse to recognize or to give evidence before any Royal Commission not appointed by themselves, and should, if necessary, organize a parallel Commission under the Western Provincial authorities"—clearly a "parallel illegal apparatus" as suggested by the Communists as an instrument for defying the authority of the central government. As for combining legal and illegal "work," the government's record of attempting to use its legal powers for illegal purposes speaks more eloquently than any elaboration here could do.

CONTROL OF MEMBERSHIP

The following instructions on the control of members are strikingly in accord with the methods employed by the Social Credit government. They could well have served as the direct inspiration for the multiplicity of pledges, covenants, registrations and other restrictions imposed not only upon members of the legislature but upon the party membership at large as means for enforcing subjection and unquestioning obedience. We quote:

"Parties desirous of joining the Third International shall be bound to inspect the personnel of their parliamentary factions, to remove all unreliable elements therefrom, to control such factions not only verbally but in reality; to subordinate them to the General Committee of the Party, and to demand from each Communist representative in parliament to subject his entire activity to the interests of real revolutionary propaganda and agitation."

Discussing the part to be played in parliament by the Communist party, the thesis says:

"The Communist party enters such institutions not for the purpose of organization work but in order to direct the masses to blow up the whole bourgeois machinery and the parliament itself from within . . . This work within the parliaments which consists chiefly in making revolutionary propaganda from the parliamentary platform, the denouncing of enemies, the ideological unification of the masses who still are looking up to the parliamentary platform, captivated by democratic illusions, especially in backward territories, etc., must be fully subordinated to the objects and tasks of the mass struggle outside the parliaments."

"If the Communists have the majority in the local government institution, they must (a) carry on a revolutionary opposition against the bourgeois central authority . . . ; (b) point out on every occasion the barriers which the bourgeois state power puts against really great changes; . . . (c) develop on this basis the sharpest revolutionary propaganda without fearing a conflict with the State authorities."

Other quotations from the thesis follow:

"Whatever the turns in the course of the struggle, the Communist party should always strive to fortify the contested positions, to get the masses used to active maneuvering, to equip them with new methods calculated to lead to an open conflict with the enemy forces. Taking advantage of every breathing space offered in order to appreciate the experience of the preceding phase of the struggle, the Communist party should strive to deepen and widen the class conflicts, to combine them nationally and internationally, by unity of goal and practical activity, and in this way at the head of the proletariat shatter all resistance on the road to its dictatorship and the social revolution . . . The party must be so organized that it shall always be in a position to adapt itself quickly to all the changes that may occur in the conditions of the struggle . . . Every illegal Communist must make the fullest use of the possibilities offered by the legal labor movement in order to become by means of intensive party activity the organizer and real leader of the great revolutionary masses."

When it is considered that the government's record in utterance and act is an almost perfect parallel of every major detail of the Communist revolutionary program, there can be little doubt but that persistence in its present course can bring only the logical consequences anticipated by the Communist prescription for reaching the goal in view. Denial

of Communistic intentions can in no wise alter the Communistic nature of the government's acts. "By their fruits ye shall know them;" and the indisputable evidence is that, whether consciously intentional or not, in precept and practice the government is following the revolutionary doctrines of Communism. It is indeed doubtful that very many of the rank and file and even of the leaders of the Social Credit movement have a proper recognition of the truly fundamental nature of their philosophy. But the fact that in comparison it stands revealed, at least in basic design if not in open profession, as closely patterned on the fundamentals of Communism, and that it is sufficiently harmonious with its doctrines to draw the active support of Communists themselves, should indicate the rational conclusion that in essence Social Credit and Communism are one.

We commend the situation to the serious consideration of loyal citizens not only in Alberta but throughout Canada.

PLAYING WITH DYNAMITE—Continued from Page One.
equally "visible and audible."

The situation is pregnant with grave dangers, and the government must be warned that as it is responsible for its creation, it must be held responsible for the consequences. **Let the government be warned that in advocating, nay, inciting to, a course of action the legality of which it has not established beforehand, it is as morally guilty of criminally unlawful conduct as if it had already violated the law involved.** The position of the Aberhart government is one in which the legality of its proposed course is not only doubtful, but has actually been declared illegal by the federal government. If therefore under such circumstances law-abiding citizens are driven to the defence of their constitutional rights against illegal encroachments upon them, those responsible for the inevitable conflict will be to blame for the consequences.

If Mr. Aberhart has enough sense to appreciate the seriousness of the situation he will immediately put a stop to this deliberate inflaming of passions, for we can assure him that there are many citizens ready, willing and able to match his every move with action appropriate to preservation of their rights as citizens of a free country. On the other hand, if the government decides to persist in its rabble-rousing endeavors, it is to be hoped that the common sense of its own followers will restrain them from becoming willing dupes to the furthering of this idiotic and dangerous folly.

Open Letter to the C.B.C.

The Chairman,
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Dear Sir: How much longer are you going to permit Premier Aberhart to violate the regulations governing radio broadcasting, which you are under obligation to uphold? We are given to understand that complaints have been made to you in the past regarding Mr. Aberhart's frequent breaches of these regulations, but still you apparently have done nothing to check him in his constant abuse of the rules.

The average citizen is required to observe the law in broadcasting. But Aberhart, who as first citizen of the province should have the decency to set a good example in law observance, quotes prices, sends commercial messages, makes high pressure sales talks on investments of doubtful value, and presents political dramatizations in the course of his supposedly religious Sunday broadcasts. Why do you let him do these things? Are you afraid of him? Is your conception of justice such that you do not perceive it as your duty to enforce your regulation with impartiality? We submit to you that the more highly placed an individual, the more should be expected of him in observance of the law; but your attitude appears to be that iniquity on the part of those in high places should be ignored.

We suggest that by his open defiance of radio laws, Aberhart is encouraging contempt for law and order; and, further, that by your failure to curb him, you are doing the same thing. You have no right to exempt Aberhart from observance of the rules laid down for your guidance in the regulation of radio broadcasting; and we insist that you do your duty.

What are YOU doing to let Aberhart know that "the will of the people" is something more than a mere party slogan? He has asked for "visible and audible" demonstration of public sentiment. Are you telling him what YOU think?

THE REBEL

Editor and Publisher—J. J. Zubick

426 - 15th Street N.W., Calgary, Alberta

"INDEPENDENT ALWAYS—NEUTRAL NEVER"

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, Calgary, Alberta.

REBELETES

The Ven. Archdeacon Swanson of the Anglican church is one of the very few church leaders with sufficient vision to appreciate the serious danger to the cause of religion in the Aberhartian blasphemies and to possess enough courage to openly and directly challenge the sacrilegious presumptuousness of the premier of this province in his prostitution of things sacred. The situation is one demanding direct, unequivocal attack. Half-measures, timid peckings by inference and innuendo, are worse than useless, as they can only serve as admissions of fear to face the issue; but worse still, such pussyfooting only confirms Aberhart in his conceit and encourages his followers in their delusion and fanaticism.

William Irvine: "Following up the tortuous trail of a government that so needs to be governed itself that it has a board over it, and experts over the board, and an absentee ruler over the experts, we may count the ash heaps of its failures. Among these may be seen covenants, credit houses, interest reduction, scrip, dividends, and the sales tax. The province has been invariably better served by the things the government abandoned than by what it began. In view of these facts who would entrust banking to such a government even were it possible for a province to secure those powers?"

Mrs. Gostick, M.L.A.: "We want your physical as well as your moral support in this fight." Is this inciting to violence or an invitation to a tea party?

Hon. E. C. Manning: "Right need not employ unfair tactics to achieve its goal." What rank hypocrisy from one who in the same breath incites an unthinking rabble to support legislation purposely designed to rob persons of their civil rights without trial!

Anyone interfering with the will of the people will be told to "get out of the way," says our premier. If by "will of the people" he means, as usual, the will of his party, we are going to interfere in every manner we think fit—and thumb our nose to Aberhart.

"Hasn't Aberhart talked back to you yet?" inquired a former U.F.A. member of the legislature of us the other day. Upon being informed that our dear premier had not as yet deigned to honor us with a direct comeback, he said: "I guess you're right when you say he is yellow." Of course we are right. If we were wrong and Aberhart had any backbone and self-respect at all, he would be talking back alright.

As the People's Weekly says: "The fact that Aberhart has denied that an early election is contemplated is an added reason for expecting it." Scrip, repudiation of obligations, taxes—the intent to do every major act the government has done was in every case first denied. And, incidentally, everything that was first denied and then tried has failed miserably.

Word comes from Edmonton that the Hon. D. B. Mullen was at one time a staunch supporter of the once notorious J. J. Maloney. And now he is a booster for a real fraud. Some people seem to just love being suckers.

John Hargrave, English Social Creditor, in his report on the Alberta situation says that in his contacts with Aberhart the premier early indicated "latent psychological intractabilities."—Pig-headedness to you.

Major Douglas, in his book "The Alberta Experiment," referring to Aberhart: "It would not be possible to claim that at any time the technical basis of Social Credit propaganda was understood by him.... In order to appreciate the somewhat unfortunate policy adopted by Mr. Aberhart after election, it is necessary to recall the peculiar combination of school-master-preacher grafted upon an unusually ambitious temperament, lacking either political experience or social sophistication, together with a popularity as the prophet of a new world, both temporal and spiritual, almost impossible of belief to those who had not witnessed it."

SOCIAL CREDIT "LOGIC"

Judging by the prominence accorded his writings, it is reasonable to assume that the views expressed by "Mac," author of the "Through Social Credit Window" articles appearing regularly in *The Albertan*, are regarded as somewhat of an authority on the social credit philosophy. This is the case, then it is small wonder that followers of the Aberhart are popularly regarded as queer in the head; for certainly it would be difficult to reconcile "Mac's" devious twistings and contradictions with the product of a sane mind.

An example of his befogged mental condition was given recently in an article in which he dealt with the subject of mixing religion and politics. In a moment of apparently unintentional honesty, he wrote: "But it should be clearly shown that such politics as are spoken of in this article are FREE OF PARTY BIAS.... It is when the church forgets itself and goes on to DEFINE WHAT SHOULD BE DONE AND HOW, that she begins to lose friends. For in so doing she herself becomes somewhat of a political party and subject to criticism."

One of the regular tricks of social crediters is to intermingle truth and error so deceptively as to make the truth serve to give the falsehood the appearance of virtue. This is a case in point. "Mac" has here given voice to a self-evident truth, and if he had applied it to the Alberta situation, he could not have uttered a more damning condemnation of Aberhart's practice of mixing religion and politics. Aberhart's pulpitering positively reeks with the "party bias" referred to and condemned by this champion of social credit. Aberhart as the head of a religious institution or church certainly does not hesitate to pretend to "define what should be done and how." The truth is that he goes farther in this respect than any other religious leader in history has ever dared to do, by blasphemously declaring that his particular political theory is actually the "absolutely guaranteed economy of God," and therefore the ONLY possible solution of the world's economic ills. Yet, although knowing these things to be true; knowing Aberhart to be perhaps the worst offender in all history in respect of the fiendish commingling of religion and politics; and despite the fact that his own summary as quoted in the foregoing is a condemnation of the practice, he not only does not oppose Aberhart, but supports him in his wilful pollution of things sacred. **CROOKED AS A SNAKE**

"Mac" goes even farther. He ridicules non-social credit politics as utterly selfish and dishonest by declaring: "When one enters the political field they must be prepared for almost anything." (The rotten grammar is his own, and on a par with his logic.) "... For the course of modern politics is in its movement similar to a snake.... The people are of importance only at election times, and then only because they have a vote which the politicians require in order that they may continue in their work of wasting good time and money."

"Mac's" cynical attitude here would again have its better application in relation to the despicable methods employed by his own political party. We challenge him to cite any evidence whatsoever from the non-social credit political history of Canada even remotely comparable in baseness to the filthy, lying, slandering and boycotting tactics employed by Aberhartism to gain and hold the support of a deluded electorate. The course of the social credit "movement" in Alberta was and is not merely "similar to a snake." It was and still is so crooked that even the most agile snake would be sure to break its back in the attempt to accommodate itself to its twistings, "starts, stops and reversals." If "Mac" does not know this, we extend to him our standing challenge to public debate in which we would undertake to prove to him that Aberhartism has been guilty of more dishonesty of purpose and practice in its brief existence than all other political parties in Canada combined in any ten years.

INVITING BOYCOTT OF ALBERTAN

But perhaps the worst, most childish drivel ever penned by this wonder-man of the Aberhart party who regards the world and all therein through the murky panes of a "Social Credit Window," was an appeal some time ago for open-mindedness in an article in which this gem of pure idiocy appears: "One is compelled to wonder," he says, "why so many people will buy a newspaper which is exclusively devoted to the promulgation of views diametrically opposed to the reader's own."

While it is obvious that this "bit of social credit wisdom" was intended to encourage the boycott of opposition newspapers, it is equally obvious that "Mac" had not the brains to realize that by its very nature

it also constituted an open request for the opposition to boycott *The Albertan*. For certainly if those opposed to social credit were to take "Mac's" advice, they would not buy nor read *The Albertan*. But, then, the crazy philosophy or sophistry of social credit must of necessity be composed of equally crazy precepts and reasonings. Its proponents are compelled to be illogical and dishonest. Of course, in order to give the APPEARANCE of honesty, they must PRETEND to desire open-mindedness. But in order to keep their followers in ignorance, they must at the same time advocate a tightly-closed mind to all opposing views, lest the truth enter. It is a reason-destroying philosophy (sic); and those who propound and encourage it in the Aberhartian manner do so to the moral degradation of the simple-minded, for which they are to be condemned as the lowest, most cowardly of human vultures.

A RECORD OF FAILURE

The recent provincial banking legislation only adds one more floundering flaw to the dismal record of maladministration carried on in this province since the present government assumed office.

The Recall Bill, heralded to introduce "real democracy," became only a smoke screen to cover up an election promise.

The system of codes and licenses, proclaimed as a panacea for all business malpractices, was apparently born to "blush unseen."

The Reduction and Settlement of Debts Act, hailed as the great solution to the financial problems of the debt-ridden masses, was declared "wholly unconstitutional" on its first appearance in Court.

The institution of scrip, which according to the Hon. Lucien Maynard would lead us from the barren wastes of poverty to the green pastures of prosperity, was so fearful a project that even the premier and his cabinet would not dare to accept 10% of their salary in its medium, although of course every civil servant was compelled to do so, and every man and woman engaged in business was threatened with boycott if they failed to co-operate by not accepting it.

The road program, which according to Hon. F. A. Fallow would provide employment, was notable mostly for a group of unemployed, ownerless horses that came here from Ontario looking for work. Since then it has become the subject of a court investigation, with the minister in charge refusing to "disclose his file".

This is the record of the government which in the words of Premier Aberhart was going to "make history." No doubt it will make history—of a kind.

Without any respect for the Constitution, without any consideration for federal rights, and regardless of the opinion of the provincial attorney-general, legislation aimed to control banks and banking is placed on the statute books without a moment's notice. Directors to be appointed to control the banks, according to the provincial secretary, "will probably know nothing about the profession of banking." Any respectable lawyer knows that such legislation could not be valid, and the members of the government know it too. It is only one more move in the Big Game of Bluff at which Premier Aberhart is the Artist Supreme—only a laughable excuse to place the onus of his own failure on other shoulders. The federal government had no alternative than to intervene, and very properly so. Every sane thinking Canadian will endorse the stand of Prime Minister Mackenzie King.

The Bank Employees Civil Rights Act would prevent any unlicensed bank employee "for any reason whatsoever from bringing, maintaining or defending any action in any court of civil jurisdiction in the Province." Compare this with Premier Aberhart's pre-election Social Credit Manual, page 57: "Social Credit makes the individual supreme. The State bends every effort to protect his rights."

Perhaps a reference to the Scriptures (Aberhart a la mode) might explain this glaring disparity. I quote: "Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing but inwardly they are ravaging wolves," or: "Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?"

What is the alternative? The majority of the people of this province are now seeking a new outlook and craving for new leadership. The time is rapidly approaching when they will be expressing themselves at the polls, and the day is at hand when other political parties must come forward with programs of honesty, progress and common sense.—E. C. COLLIER, LL.B., president Mackenzie King-Young Liberal Club, Calgary.

QUESTIONS FOR ANDERSON

Mr. Fred Anderson, M.L.A.

Dear Sir: You were kind enough to supply written answers to a series of questions put to you by the Calgary Herald. The questions were very simple, yet judging by the conglomeration of nonsense contained in your answers, they apparently were too "deep" for your obviously shallow mind. We are therefore submitting a number of questions considerably less technical on matters of which you should have full information, each being answerable with a simple "yes" or "no." Here they are:

1. You have stated that the co-operation expected of the banks is "to implement the demand of the people for \$25 a month and a lower cost of living." If this is the case, did you know it to be so two years ago?

2. You supported Aberhart in the claim two years ago that he had a perfect Social Credit plan. Were you lying then?

3. You presided at a public meeting at which Social Credit members of the legislature contended that Aberhart had admitted in caucus never having had a Social Credit plan.

(a) Were you present at the caucus when this alleged admission was made?

(b) Were these members telling the truth?

4. At this same meeting it was charged that Aberhart had double-crossed the members of his own party by underhandedly conspiring to block passage of the government's own interim supply vote and to cause circulation of a petition demanding his own resignation.

(a) Were these members lying?

(b) Were you aware of the alleged conspiracies?

(c) If you were aware of them, would you say that an honorable person could "co-operate" with a person capable of such dishonorable conduct?

(d) If you did not know of them, would you say that you could honorably co-operate with those who charged Aberhart with such dishonorable conduct?

(e) Do you consider yourself an honorable man by now co-operating with both Aberhart and his accusers in the foregoing?

5. Subsequent to the above-mentioned meeting and before the arrival of Powell and Byrne Aberhart declared from his Calgary pulpit that the government had a perfect Social Credit plan all ready to put into operation. Was he lying?

6. You know that Aberhart has claimed the Social Credit theory to be the "economy of God." Do you believe him?

7. Do you believe the Social Credit theory to be human and therefore fallible?

8. You know that Aberhart has publicly advocated boycott of opposition newspapers. Do you consider this an honorable thing to do?

9. If during the first eighteen months in power your government had no plan and you knew it had no plan, and yet you still indicated during all this time that there was a plan, were you not committing a deliberate fraud?

10. Do you not think that in his use of religion to induce people to believe that he had a plan when all the time he had none, Aberhart was guilty of blasphemy?

11. The government's bank legislation contemplated depriving certain citizens of their civil rights. Do you consider it as British or Christian or fair from any other standard whatsoever to ever at any time under any circumstances punish anyone, whether citizen or not, without trial?

12. We charge that Aberhart is a liar and unscrupulous deceiver of the people and that by supporting him you are unfit to hold public office. Will you accept our challenge to debate the matter publicly?

HERBERT'S HOOEY

"What God has blessed let no man put asunder." The correct version of this slightly twisted Scriptural injunction is customarily offered to couples upon their entry into the solemn contract of marriage, and its context in the Bible suggests this as the intended application. But W. R. Herbert, president of the Calgary Social Credit constituency association, gave it a considerably wider application when in the course of a brief address from the pulpit of the Bible Institute he used it for the purpose of

furthering the pernicious fraud that his particular brand of politics is something enjoying a peculiarly special blessing of the Almighty. In this he is, of course, only following the lead of his chief, Aberhart, in the latter's blasphemous and arrogant claim that Social Credit is the "economy of God."

Mr. Herbert is either very stupid, in which case he is to be pitied, or most unscrupulous, in which case he deserves no sympathy. In either case he must be told that he is committing a serious moral offence and offering an affront to God when he aids in the dissemination of the gross Aberhart lie in regard to the alleged divine nature of Social Credit. Mr. Herbert knows, if he has any brains at all, that the theory of Social Credit is but one of a number of human and therefore fallible theories. It may be better than any other political theory yet advanced, and it may be worse. Certainly there is not the slightest evidence to indicate its allegedly divine characteristics. If there is, it has never been presented. On the other hand, there is much positive evidence to support the contention that it had its birth quite some distance this side of Heaven, and that its chief proponent in Alberta, William Aberhart, at least, despite his boast to the contrary, it is not divinely—but Satanically—inspired. In any case, by aping his leader in falsely representing the Social Credit theory as a special product of Heaven, Mr. Herbert is assuming a heavy responsibility for whether in ignorance or with conscious intent, he is deceiving those who may succumb to his appeal to their superstitious credulity.

We trust that Mr. Herbert will not take our reproof unkindly, but that, rather, he will ponder over the proverb: "He, that being often reproved hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy."

Social Credit in Reverse

The Hon. Lucien Maynard states that disallowance of the bank legislation has "hastened advent of Social Credit by three months." This sounds like another of those forward steps in reverse by our crafty government. If the government would now be so good as to fix the exact length of time Social Credit is still in the future, it should be a comparatively simple matter to arrange with the federal authorities for the disallowance of enough acts with a "reverse" value of three months each to have Social Credit in effect right now, or perhaps even a year or so ago. But one serious objection to this monkeying with time is that it might shift Aberhart's "Rapture" out of alignment with the space between his left thumb and forefinger, which he uses to explain the prophetic "gap" between something or other, to say nothing of the possible effect on the space between his ears.

SPECIAL!

OFFER No. 1

Six back numbers of The Rebel—Nos. 1 to 6 inclusive, for

25¢

Sent postpaid to any address.

OFFER No. 2

Full series of 12 issues, including above six back numbers, for

75¢

Postpaid to any address.

OFFER No. 3

Balance of series of 12 commencing with either No. 7 or 8, postpaid to any address, for

50¢

In placing your order kindly specify number of the offer it is desired to accept, and in the case of No. 3, state whether subscription is to commence with No. 7 or No. 8.

THE REBEL

426 15th Street N.W.

Calgary, Alta.

NEWS OF

McKINLEY CAMERON, K.C.**"WHY COMMUNISTS SUPPORT ABERHART"**

J. J. Zubick, Esq., Editor The Rebel.

Dear Mr. Zubick: You have asked me for my views on the article, "Why Communists Support Aberhart," being published in the present issue of The Rebel. The judgment in the case of Rex vs. Buck is the rarest and most authoritative analysis of the philosophy, aims and objects of the Communist party of Canada that I know of. I know of no criticism of the findings of the Ontario Court of Appeal on what are the Communists' aims, objects and methods. While this trial and judgment attracted wide attention, both at the time and since, I have always thought that not enough publicity has been given to the revelations and evidence in that case.

I believe many people in this country who are either sympathetic, indifferent to, the actions of this destructive body, have little or no knowledge of its philosophy. Buck and eight others were charged with three offences, or, in legal phraseology, the indictment consisted of three separate counts, and the defendants were all tried together on these three counts. At the hearing one defendant was dropped from the charge, while the other eight, including Buck, were found guilty on all three counts.

These counts were as follows: (1) "did become and continue to be members of an unlawful association, to wit, the Communist party of Canada, section of the Communist International;" (2) "did act or profess to act as officers of an unlawful association, to wit, the Communist party of Canada, section of the Communist International, and did become and continue to be members thereof;" (3) "did become party to a seditious conspiracy contrary to the provisions of the Criminal Code."

The first two counts were laid under the famous section 98 of the Code, since repealed at the insistent demand of the Communists. Buck and six others were sentenced to five years on the first two counts and ten years on the third count, sentences to run concurrently. An appeal was taken on the convictions on all counts.

As there is some discussion, both public and private, as to whether sedition is now rampant in this province, it may be of interest to your readers to know what happened in the conviction on the third count. This count was: "did become a party to a seditious conspiracy contrary to the provisions of the Criminal Code." This charge, if properly laid, is now and always has been an offence against the criminal laws of Canada. At a trial, the technical objection was taken to the form of this charge on the ground of insufficiency, the point being that the count should have set out the specific acts which constituted the seditious conspiracy. The Crown, on the trial, attempted to remedy this defect by giving particulars as follows:

"Did become and continue to be members of the Communist party of Canada, section of the Communist International, and did conspire together to further the objects and aims of the said party and that the objects and aims of the said Communist party of Canada, section of the Communist International, are of a seditious nature intended to incite His Majesty's subjects to attempt otherwise than by lawful means the alteration of the Government of the Dominion of Canada and to incite persons to commit crimes and disturbance of the peace and raise discontent or dissatisfaction among His Majesty's subjects and to promote feelings of ill will and hostility between different classes of such subjects."

The Court held that the particular could not be used to make valid and invalid indictments. The importance of the decision, however, is that while the conviction on the third count was quashed, the Court has given an accurate definition of what sedition means, and had the particulars been included in the original indictment, the indictment would have been valid and the conviction sustained. Chief Justice Mulock in dealing with this point says: "The third count of the indictment I think fails for insufficiency.... Had the count embodied in it matter found in the particulars then the offence would have been adequately charged."

I have been frequently asked ever since the inflammatory and dangerous speeches have been sent over the radio as to whether or not these instigations to violence constitute an offence under the Criminal Code. Any interested in this point can consider the definition established by this case and draw their own conclusions as to whether the offence of sedition has been committed and by whom.

Yours very truly,

J. McK. CAMERON.

TOO LATE, MR. HUGILL

Although his refusal to sanction the illegal legislation of his government is said by some to have branded him as an honest man, neither this act nor anything else the Hon. Mr. Hugill is likely to do or say can redeem his honor in the eyes of the public. The only hope Mr. Hugill has of regaining the respect of the public lies in an open confession that up to the time of his resignation from the cabinet his association with the Aberhart party and government was a conscious and wilful deception of the people.

If, as he has declared, he always held the view that Social Credit could not be introduced independently in the province, his careful avoidance of indicating such a conviction during the election campaign and subsequently while in office can only be construed as that he saw in the condition of religio-political emotionalism engendered by Aberhart an opportunity for insinuating himself into a soft job. It is certain that he did take full advantage of the opportunity. He allowed himself to be personally hand-picked by Aberhart, and at no time, did he intimate that he then held the views he now professes to hold in extenuation of his disagreement with the government. Neither can he justify himself by now saying that he was solely motivated by the desire to assist in rendering "honest government" and of having entertained a vague hope that "some sort of social credit" might be introduced. The bald truth is that Mr. Hugill was one of Aberhart's most enthusiastic anglers for suckers with the bait of \$25 to \$75 per month specifically and alluringly dangled before the electorate, and openly declared to be constitutionally possible. If Mr. Hugill knew this claim to be impossible, then he was knowingly supporting and encouraging a fraud. If he knew this, then he must have strange notions in regard to "honest" government, as in such circumstances he was himself already dishonest before even getting into power.

Mr. Hugill is but suffering the merited disgrace and humiliation which every member of the Aberhart party must undergo in due time. He is the victim of a shameful deception which he himself helped to perpetrate. And unless and until he publicly confesses his full guilt and acknowledges his since contrition over the terrible wrong he has done—and proves his sincerity by resigning his seat in the legislature, he can only expect to be held in supreme disgust and contempt by the public in general.

Maynard and the "Law of God"

The Hon. Lucien Maynard appears to have swallowed hook, line, sinker and pole the Aberhartian blasphemy that Social Credit is the "economy of God," by his contention in the legislature that the provincial legislation on the control and licensing of banks not only was constitutional but that if it were not, then the federal constitution was in contravention of the law of God "Thou shalt not kill."

Maynard's reasoning is based on the fallacious assumption that "one of the fundamental rights belonging to man throughout the world is the right to existence;" and here we are quoting Mr. Maynard's own words from a report of his speech in the legislature in his own paper, "Today and Tomorrow," of which he himself is the editor. This premise reminds us of the plaint of the young man to Voltaire: "But I must live," and the philosopher's classic reply: "I do not perceive the necessity."

To put it more bluntly, Mr. Maynard's edifice is built on the usual misconception of the popular claim: "The world owes me a living." There is nothing in Divine Law to warrant the assumption that man has an unconditional "right to existence." On the contrary, both Divine Law and common sense dictate that "He who will not work neither shall he eat," and that if the world owes us a living, our enjoyment of its good things is conditional upon our being our own collectors of the debt. And here, we think, lies the chief cause of our economic disorder—in the desire of all too many to get "something for nothing," a vice which has been exalted to a virtue by the perverted economic philosophy of Social Credit, particularly by Aberhart, who has publicly likened it to the Gift of God as represented in Christ's atonement on the Cross.

The Next Issue

The date of the next issue cannot be definitely announced, as it will largely depend upon political developments. If possible, we shall publish two issues in September.

And HE Was Hanged!

"After a critical examination of the evidence, I find it impossible to come to any other conclusion than that at which the jury arrived. The Appellant is, beyond any doubt, a man of inordinate vanity, excitable, irritable, and impatient of contradiction. He seems to have at times acted in an extraordinary manner; to have said strange things, and to have entertained, or at least professed to entertain, absurd views on religious and political subjects. But it all stops far short of establishing such unsoundness of mind as would render him irresponsible, not accountable for his actions. His course of conduct indeed shows, in many ways, that the whole of his apparently extraordinary conduct, his claims to divine inspiration, and the prophetic character was only part of a cunningly devised scheme to gain and hold influence and power over the simple-minded people around him, and to secure personal immunity in the event of his ever being called to account for his actions.... He seems to have in view, while professing to champion the cause of the Metis, the securing of pecuniary advantage for himself."

The above is not original with us. Neither was it written in reference to our Premier or any of his ministers. It is simply a quotation from the judgment of Mr. Justice Taylor of the Court of Queen's Bench for the province of Manitoba on the appeal of Louis Riel. In the year 1885, Louis Riel, a prominent citizen of Western Canada, was tried for treason at Regina and was convicted by a jury, which rejected a plea of insanity. An appeal was taken from this conviction to the Court of Queen's Bench of Manitoba, and the above words are quoted from Judge Taylor of that Court in dealing with the question of insanity. Riel was later hanged for his crime. If the description fits any prominent citizen or citizens of our province, please don't blame us.

Dishonest Argumentation

An example of the rank speciousness of argument common to Social Crediters when they find themselves unable to defend a case on its merits was given by the Hon. Lucien Maynard in the discussion in the House relative to the political activities of technician G. F. Powell.

"All Mr. Powell was doing," said Mr. Maynard in defence of the expert, "was not to speak of politics, not to assist a political party, but merely to discuss public questions." He also cited the case of Capt. Scott who had been fired from the magistracy for the alleged reason that he had "discussed public affairs on the public platform."

It would be difficult to conceive of a more irrational argument, for if Mr. Maynard can justify the dismissal of Capt. Scott on the ground of having discussed public affairs in public, the argument should apply with equal force to Mr. Powell's case. But the two cases are not even analogous. Maynard knows that Scott did not discuss local public or political matters, but that his only offence was that he lectured to service clubs on the European and Ethiopian situations, which, incidentally tends to strengthen the suspicion that the real reason for his dismissal was never given at all. On the contrary, when Mr. Maynard says that Powell was not talking politics nor assisting a political party but merely discussing public questions, he is uttering a cheap falsehood. Powell has been officially designated as the "political" expert of the two engaged by the government, and the incontrovertible facts are that on every occasion when he has spoken at political meetings of the Aberhart party he has acted as an official propagandist for the partisan politics of that party. To contend otherwise is to admit colossal stupidity or rank dishonesty.

"A Man Who Can't Think"

"It is a terrible thing that such enormous influence has been entrusted to a man who simply can't think. All Hitler's intellectual sources are second-hand." So declared Dr. Hans Simon of the New York school of social research the other day, and while we do not vouch for the accuracy of his verdict on the intellectual standard of Herr Hitler, we suggest that it fits that of Fuehrer Aberhart to a "T."

If an evaluation of the man Aberhart brings one fact out into bold relief, it is his apparent lack of native intelligence and utter incapability for original thinking. His entire public record is one of an ego-maniac trying to pawn off a hopelessly confused and conflicting jumble of second-hand ideas and thoughts as profound and at times even as divine wisdom. It is significant that whenever and wherever he has contrived to introduce a personal idea into any major problem, the result was invariably affected adversely in proportion to the degree of the originality of the idea—as witness the sorry mess made of the alleged social credit legislation with which he had anything to do during the first

eighteen months in office. Every major piece of legislation is a monument to the sterility of his intellect in point of capability for creative thought. In no case could he have failed more miserably if he had deliberately set out upon a course directly opposite of his declared intention.

The only direction in which Mr. Aberhart appears to possess a talent may be said to have successfully (?) applied originality of thought in his amazing ability to devise unscrupulous methods for deception of the people. Although astonishingly crude in his methods (the crudeness obviously being deliberate), it must be conceded that in the gaining of wide acceptance of his wilful misrepresentations of facts, evasion of issues and downright lies and slanders, etc., as "wisdom from on High" he stands in a class by himself.

Registration of Bonds

We think we are beginning to understand why the government was so anxious to obtain registration of bondholders some time ago and why it was so reluctant to give any explanation of its purpose. We are indebted to the "New Age," London, Eng., for a copy of Douglas "Draft Social Credit Scheme for Scotland," Article 2 of which reads in part as follows:

"As from the initiation of this scheme, the holding of any stock, share or bond by a holding company or trustee will not be recognised. It is the intention that no shareholding in any industrial undertaking shall be other than in the form of equity shares of no par value, i.e., Preference or Common shares of stock. Bonded indebtedness will be recognised when held by individuals, upon a proper investigation, but where held by corporations will be subject to such terms of redemption as may seem desirable."

Afraid to Answer Critics

On various occasions we have been reminded of the fact that Mr. Aberhart has so far declined to make any direct reply to our criticism and some undoubtedly have concluded from this that he considers The Rebel as beneath his august dignity.

We're deucedly clever and all that, but we cannot read minds, and the best we can do is to judge Aberhart by his utterances and conduct. We do know this, however, that we are not the only critic to enjoy the distinction of immunity to the Aberhartian blasts; and, further, it is our observation that the more pointed and serious the criticism against our dear premier, the more profound is his silence. He does not reply to William Irvine, Joseph Shaw, K.C., and a number of other prominent men of the province who have been dishing out some really hefty punches to the prophet-premier-windbag. In fact, the reader will have difficulty in recalling any instance in which Aberhart has ever made direct reply to any critic. True, he has upon certain propitious occasions singled out letters of inane criticism from some nitwit and poked fun at him in the course of his Sunday broadcasts; but he has yet to offer a direct reply to any really serious criticism or telling argument.

It isn't that Aberhart would not like to squelch his critics. The whole world knows that he would just love to muzzle the press and still all criticism. We have very good reasons for the assertion that he would put The Rebel out of commission if he thought he could get away with it; that, in fact, he went so far as to discuss the matter with the Calgary solicitors and even tried to get the attorney-general (Hughes) to take action against us, but was turned down.

The truth undoubtedly is that Aberhart would crush all opposition if he could do so with the least semblance of justification and without placing himself into a position where he would be compelled to defend himself against the charges made against him. But he is too yellow to engage in open, direct man-to-man conflict under circumstances and conditions of equality with an opponent. In addition to being utterly spineless, he also knows full well that he is guilty of the dishonorable conduct charged against him and that he could not possibly justify himself in open and direct debate or controversy. He must therefore resort to the coward's weapons of defense and attack by innuendo, indirect slander and ridicule.

Those who have any doubts in the matter need but to compare the open, bold directness of Aberhart's critics with his hypocritical vagueness